UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/584,164 | 04/09/2007 | Hansjoerg Meerpohl | 2003P01977WOUS | 4747 |

46726 7590 04/28/2010

BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD
NEW BERN, NC 28562

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 3743 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/28/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NBN-IntelProp@bshg.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/584,164 | MEERPOHL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Stephen M. Gravini | 3743 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *16-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 April 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Claims 16-19, 23, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke (US 3,702,030) in view of Hughes (US 2,961,776). The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by Janke as comprising:

performing a drying program including a heating-up phase, a drying phase, and a cooling-down phase at column 7 lines 13-35;

performing an anti-crease cycle having alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter at column 5 lines 18-48; or alternatively:

a housing **10**;

a drum **11** receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing;

a motor **17** coupled to the drum for driving rotation of the drum;

an inlet duct **13** providing an air flow to the drum and a heating device selectively heating air in the inlet duct; an outlet duct receiving the air flow from the drum;

a control device **23**coupled to the motor and controlling rotation of the drum, the control device performing an anti-crease cycle including alternatingly rotating the drum during rotary movement time intervals and stopping rotation of the drum during stoppage time intervals, the control device decreasing the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter at column 5 lines 18-48. Janke also discloses the claimed operating parameter includes the length of time of the anti-crease cycle as shown in figure 3, act of detecting the temperature of the laundry with a sensor and the operating parameter includes a decrease in the temperature of the laundry at column 8 lines 31-56, act of detecting the residual moisture of the laundry with a sensor and the operating parameter includes a decrease in the residual moisture of the laundry at column 7 lines 13-35, act of detecting at least one of a quantity of laundry, a heating-up time, a laundry moisture, a laundry moisture profile, a laundry specific conductance, a profile of the laundry specific conductance, a moisture content and/or the moisture profile, a temperature of the laundry, a temperature profile of the laundry, a temperature of the drying air, a temperature profile of the drying air in the drum of the laundry dryer, a comparison of the moisture content, a moisture profile, a temperature of the drying air, a temperature profile of the drying air in the drum of the laundry dryer between entry into the drum and exit from the drum, and a time before reaching a drying target at column 8 lines 31-56, timing element providing a length of time of the anti-crease cycle to the control device and the operating parameter including an increase in the length of time of the anti-crease cycle as shown in figure 3, temperature sensor detecting the

temperature of the laundry and providing a temperature signal to the control device indicating the temperature of the laundry, the operating parameter including the temperature signal at column 8 lines 31-56, electrodes detecting a moisture level of the laundry and providing a moisture signal to the control device indicating the moisture level of the laundry, the operating parameter including the moisture signal at column 7 lines 13-35. Janke discloses the invention as claimed, except for the claimed feature after the drying phase has been performed, an anti-crease cycle is introduced. Hughes, another laundry dryer, discloses that feature at column 5 line 63 through column 6 line 3. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke with the anti-crease feature of Hughes for the purpose of optimizing energy by minimizing the amount of energy used in laundry drying by use of an anti-crease feature.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke in view of Hughes in view of St. Louis (US 2003/0097764). Janke in view of Hughes discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed user pre-selection. St. Louis, another dryer, discloses that feature in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke in view of Hughes with the user pre-selection feature in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke in view of Hughes in view of Liebermann (US 3.060,591). Janke in view of Hughes discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed step of

detecting an amount of laundry. Liebermann, another dryer, discloses that feature at column 2 lines 18-69. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke in view of Hughes with the detecting an amount of laundry feature in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke in view of Hughes in view of Worst (US 3,309,783). Janke in view of Hughes discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed step of reverse rotation. Worst, another dryer, discloses that feature at column 1 liens 14-60. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke in view of Hughes with the reverse rotation feature in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke in view of Hughes. Janke in view of Hughes discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed stop time intervals with subsequent magnitudes. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to recite that feature, since the teachings of Janke in view of Hughes would perform the invention, as claimed, regardless of the recited time intervals and magnitude.

Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke in view of Hughes in view of Kohlman et al. (US 6,381,870). Janke in view of Hughes discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed anti-crease feature. Kohlman, another dryer, discloses that feature at column 4 line 53 through column 5 line 17. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to

combine the teachings of Janke in view of Hughes with the anti crease feature of Kohlman in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed March 11, 2010 have been fully considered but they are moot based on the new grounds of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Other prior art references cited with this action disclose one ore more features of the claimed invention, but are not relied upon in this action, in rejecting the claims.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272

4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth B. Rinehart can be reached on 571 272 4881. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen M. Gravini/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3743